

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | F | IRST NAMED INVENTOR | AT | TORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-------------|---|---------------------|----|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/695,760 | 10/30/2003 | | Beverley C. Woodson | | 021238-550 | 6889 | |
| 21839 7590 04/16/2007 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 | | | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | | | LAZORCIK, JASON L | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 | | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | | 1731 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | | | 04/16/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| 10/695,760 | WOODSON ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Jason L. Lazorcik | 1731 | |

| | | 7.000 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Jason L. Lazorcik | 1731 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>03/29/2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLI | | • | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance | n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o | Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire l | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | | FIRST REPLY WAS F | ILED WITHIN |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL. | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) a: |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | diance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be | filed within two month | se of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | |
| AMENDMENTS | born a decide that dans a feet and the | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | | | ecause |
| (b) ☐ They raise thew issues that would require further co | | i E below); | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rei | ected claims | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | ecteu ciaims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | ` '' | maliant Amandment | (DTOL 224) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | mphant Amendment | (F10L-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | time also tile also anno an also a | |
| non-allowable claim(s). | nowabie ii submitted in a separate, | umely liled amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will vided below or appended. | ll be entered and an e | explanation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to: | | | • |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-38. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is | t be entered s necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fai | Is to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ned. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | ` | |
| 13. Other: | | the Mi | |
| | | STEVEN P. GRIFF | |
| | SUPER | RVISORY PATENT EXAM. | |

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1701

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The currently ammended claims 1, 33, and 34 which currently recite the phrase "a tobacco rod including a tobacco-containing mat having a tubular form" raise new issues that require further search and consideration. As indicated in the previous Office Action, Applicants specification appears to provide adequate precedent for a tobacco-containing mat circumscribing a tobacco rod" but not the previously claimed language wherein a tobacco containing mat is "incorporated into a tobacco rod". Applicants current ammendments appear to broaden the claim scope even further by requiring "a tobacco rod including a tobacco-containing mat". At the very least, the new scope of the claim will require further search and consideration.

Further, Applicants arguments against the applicability of McCarty under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and McCarty in view of Shi under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but found unpersuasive. First Applicant argues that McCarty only teaches cigars containing tobacco material as a component of a cigar wrap and that therefore Mccarty does not disclose tobacco material as a component of carbon filled paper or the cigarette paper of a cigarette. However applicant relies upon a citation from McCarty (page 10, last paragraph) which recited in part first that "...the tobacco materials used to make cigar wrap are preferred..." and that "Ideally, the carbon filled paper is used as an innerwrap under a normal outer wrap for the tobacco column of the cigarette". In light of this passage, it is clear that McCarty in fact does teach inclusion of a tobacco material as a component in the carbon filled paper.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants ammendments introduce new issues which require further search and consideration.